## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-9 and 11-13 are pending in the Application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is being amended to improve its form. No new matter is involved.

In Paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, it is indicated that the previous rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been withdrawn in view of Applicants' Amendment and arguments. This has been duly noted.

In Paragraph 5 which begins on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-9, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,690,805 of Tsuji, et al. In Paragraph 7 which begins on page 6 of the Office Action, claims 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,690,805 of Tsuji, et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed, particularly in view of the amendments being made herein to claim 1.

In claim 1 as amended herein, the LPF limitation has been moved to the position of the first paragraph under the preamble and recites "an LPF for blocking a sub-signal and a pilot signal in a high frequency band of the input audio signal and passing only a main signal of the input audio signal". This is followed by the recitation of an interpolation circuit which, as amended, reads "for interpolation processing on the main signal output from the LPF". This is followed by the recitation of "a noise detection circuit for detecting the noise portion of said input audio signal" as previously recited in the claim. The final limitation of claim 1, as amended, recites "a selection circuit replacing the noise portion of said input audio signal with an output signal from said interpolation circuit according to an output signal from said noise detection circuit". This limitation is described at lines 8-15 of page 4 of the Specification.

As so amended herein, claim 1 is submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over Tsuji, et al. '805. In accordance with the present invention, the LPF passes the main signal. This means that the LPF does not substantially remove a part of the main signal, and a noise portion of the audio signal is replaced only by the output of the interpolation circuit that performs interpolation processing for the main signal.

As previously pointed out by Applicants, Tsuji, et al. '805 does not show an LPF that blocks a sub-signal and a pilot signal in a high frequency band of the input audio signal and passes only a main signal of the input audio signal.

In the Response to Arguments on page 8 of the Office Action, it is said that the arguments previously made by Applicants are not cited in the rejected claims. The arguments are said to be more specific than the claims. However, as amended herein, claim 1, and claims 2-9 and 11-13 which depend directly or indirectly therefrom, set forth the detailed subject matter commensurate with Applicants' arguments.

Therefore, as so amended, claim 1 is submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over Tsuji, et al. '805.

Claims 2-9 and 11-13 depend, directly or indirectly from, and contain all of the limitations of claim 1, so that such claims are also submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the art.

Therefore, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6846 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 09/603,184 Amdt. Dated August 2, 2006 Reply to Office Action of May 4, 2006 Attorney Docket No. 81784.0211 Customer No.: 26021

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,

HOGAN & HARTSQN L.L.P.

Date: August 2, 2006

John P. Scherlacher Registration No. 23,009 Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900 Los Angeles, California 90071

Phone: 213-337-6700 Fax: 213-337-6701